

VU Research Portal

Analytical support tools for sustainable futures

Akgun, A.A.; van Leeuwen, E.S.; Nijkamp, P.

2013

document version

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Akgun, A. A., van Leeuwen, E. S., & Nijkamp, P. (2013). *Analytical support tools for sustainable futures*. (pp. 1-19). (Research Memorandum; No. 2013-18). Faculty of Economics and Business Administration.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Analytical support tools for sustainable futures

Research Memorandum 2013-18

**Aliye Ahu Akgün
Eveline van Leeuwen
Peter Nijkamp**

ANALYTICAL SUPPORT TOOLS FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURES

Aliye Ahu Akgün^a, Eveline van Leeuwen^b, Peter Nijkamp^b

^s Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey

^b Dept. of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

The aim of this study is to assess the usefulness of analytical tools for policy evaluation. The study focuses on a multi-method integrated toolkit for sustainability assessment, the so-called SMILE toolkit¹. This toolkit is developed to provide salient features that are required for monitoring policy-making in a spatial-environmental context. The sustainable development perspective is rather difficult to operationalize due to its dynamism and its multi-dimensionality. Therefore, in this study, we aim to assess the usefulness of the SMILE toolkit for sustainable development issues on the basis of a systemic set of critical factors for sustainable development. We will demonstrate the usefulness of the toolkit in order to create awareness among policymakers on the critical factors for sustainable development in the future.

¹ The SMILE toolkit consists of the integration of three evaluation frameworks developed within an EU-funded consortium called 'Development and Comparison of Sustainability' (DECOIN) and further applied within the follow-up consortium 'Synergies in Multi-Scale Inter-Linkages of Eco-social systems' (SMILE).

1 INTRODUCTION

Sustainability is the ability to maintain economic-ecological dynamism in a complex spatial-environmental system and to remain viable and resilient in perpetuity. Therefore, sustainable development is the development through which continuity of settlements and environments is ensured, while increasing the well-being of inhabitants and offering a desirable 'milieu' for new economic activities. Sustainable futures are the desired outcomes of many policy evaluations and strategic planning processes. These futures can be achieved only by communication, implementation and monitoring of these policies in a systemic, orchestrated and disciplined manner (Eppler and Platts, 2009). A way to cope with this challenge is the visualization and graphic representation of the current situations and future trends, so as to build up strategic and/or early-warning scenarios for pro-active policies.

As sustainable development and related policies are complex in nature, a systemic approach may offer a practical frame of reference. In general, a systems approach aims at portraying the processes and relationships in a complex system that encompass various components which are linked together by means of functional, technical, institutional or behavioural linkages (Harvey, 1969). Although this systemic approach helps to present the current situation and trends, not every stakeholder is capable of understanding the complex outcomes of such solutions, as they are often no experts nor researchers, but rather decision-makers or action groups. Therefore, an understandable presentation is very important if researchers want their outcomes to be effectively used in the real world.

In these circumstances, the outcomes of analytical tools used for policy evaluation play an important role in explaining how to design relevant policies and strategic solutions. In the literature, regarding the strength of visual outputs, facilitating a synthesis (Vessey, 1991), enabling the development of new perspectives (De Bono, 1973) and better comparisons (Lurie and Mason, 2007), integrating different perspectives (DiMicco et al., 2004) and creating involvement and engagement (Buzan, 1995 and Huff, 1990) are often stressed (see for more details Eppler and Platts, 2009).

In this study we will focus on the above mentioned reporting and visualization tools with the aim of assessing their usefulness. In this context, the so-called SMILE toolkit is basically a multi-method integrated toolkit. It consists of the integration of three evaluation frameworks, viz. Advanced Sustainability Analysis (ASA), Sustainability Multi-criteria Multi-scale Assessment (SUMMA), and Multi-Scale Integrated Analysis of Societal and Ecosystem Metabolism (MSIASSEM). More details on these various approaches are contained in Section 3 of the present paper. The toolkit is developed to provide salient features that are required for monitoring policy-making on the basis of the analysis of the different dimensions of sustainability and for investigating trade-offs and synergies between different aspects of sustainable development. Clearly, the sustainable development perspective is rather difficult to operationalize due to its dynamism and its multi-dimensionality. Therefore, we will investigate the usefulness of this toolkit in helping to better understand the dynamism/new trends in relation to different dimensions of sustainability. To reach our research aim, we present an operational method that uses critical factors of sustainable development when determining the toolkit to be processed by means of an outranking method. It is basically an impact structure matrix which reflects the impacts of policy measures (Nijkamp, 1983). During our

evaluation, we employ the success and failure factors of the toolkit and the sustainability factors defined in a previous study (Akgün et al., 2011).

In this introductory section, we have highlighted the importance and usefulness of reporting and visualization tools for policy evaluation. In the following section, we will present the instrument that we are interested in this study in order to assess the usefulness of reporting tools. In Section 3, we assess this usefulness, the results of our findings by using the so-called impact matrix. The study concludes by discussing what are the most important factors to increase the usefulness of the analytical tools.

2 CRITICAL FACTORS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Sustainability has been the subject of intense discourse at a conceptual level, but unfortunately it has not been treated so often in operational contexts. Here, we offer a systemic operational contribution through the use of case studies, in which the so-called 'Pentagon model' is used as a methodological vehicle.

The 'Pentagon concept' has been developed and used in systems thinking/evaluation in case of a multidimensional complexity (Nijkamp, 2008). In the literature, there are several applications of the Pentagon model which have demonstrated its methodological power and empirical validity in various case studies. The Pentagon approach has amongst others been applied in several policy studies in recent decades, in order to assess the critical success/ failure factors of a policy (see, e.g. Nijkamp et al., 1994; Nijkamp and Pepping, 1998; Capello et al., 1999; Nijkamp and Yim, 2001; Nijkamp, 2008). Essentially, this model aims to map out, in a structured manner, the various forces that represent the critical factors that are essential contributors to the performance of a given policy (Nijkamp and Pepping, 1998). What this rather stylized approach does is to allow some of the key issues of the policies under consideration to be discussed in a systemic way. It highlights key dimensions in decision making and also enables us to look at those areas where policy initiatives can influence the way in which sustainable development is enhanced (Button, 1998). It is a systematic evaluation to determine the (most) critical success factors and sub-factors in sustainable development policies.

Success conditions refer to the necessary – though not sufficient – conditions that are to be fulfilled to meet *a priori* given objectives concerning sustainable development, such as economic performance, social cohesion, or ecological quality. The failure conditions are to be interpreted in a different way. They refer to those factors that drive the performance of a system towards levels that are unacceptable from the perspective of *a priori* specified objectives. By determining the critical factors, the Pentagon model is formed by a Pentagon prism which represents the interdependent between the necessary – though not yet sufficient – conditions for successful policies (see Figure 1). The original Pentagon model, as it was when first developed more than a decade ago, distinguishes five key factors, viz. software (e.g. knowledge), hardware (e.g. research facilities), finware (e.g. financial support), ecoware (e.g. environmental amenities) and orgware (e.g. institutional support systems). These pentagon factors can be applied to both the supply side and the demand side of economic-ecological-technological systems.




Figure 1. The original Pentagon prism comprising necessary conditions for a successful policy

The pentagon approach offers a flexible methodology and has been used in various studies, viz. the evaluation of energy policies (Nijkamp and Pepping, 1998; Capello et al., 1999); the quality of the urban economy (Nijkamp, 2008); sustainable rural development (Gülümser, 2009). Each pentagon model is generated from the original stylized pentagon model, so that critical factors of different systems are developed on the basis of necessary achievement conditions. In addition, researchers have adjusted the original model to fit any new topic under investigation. For instance, Capello and her colleagues in 1999 and Nijkamp and Pepping in 1998 used the original Pentagon factors, while Nijkamp in 2008 adjusted these factors to assess the highest possible quality of an urban economy, where the Pentagon factors used were: economic capital; ecological resources; technological systems; geographical infrastructure; and social suprastructure. In addition, a most recent example of the model published by Gülümser in 2009 to underpin sustainable rural development is based on the necessary conditions defined for sustainable development in the Brundtland Report in 1987, and used systems thinking with regard to the physical system, social system, economic system, locality system, and creative system.

In conclusion, Pentagon models applied in various studies show the validity of the model for systems thinking. In other words, such a model offers a valid framework for analysing different problems of an overall system by identifying drivers of the whole system through the identification and analysis of its critical components. The Pentagon model can be formulated and operationalized as the result of in-depth questionnaires or interviews carried out among stakeholders in relevant case-studies: this has been applied in the above mentioned project.

The original conceptual Pentagon framework can be seen as the starting point for the development of our basic model in the SMILE framework. In developing specific stakeholder-based models, we start our systemic approach on the basis of five critical drivers of a system. First, with the help of a literature review for the case concerned and the expertise of researchers with specific knowledge about the case studies, a basic SMILE Pentagon model has been formulated (Figure 2). In a second step, the model is validated and improved by employing information and insights from (local) stakeholders or experts. This is done by extensive interviews and sometimes by additional questionnaires.




Figure 2. The pentagon model of sustainable development

The final stakeholder-specific Pentagon model comprising five key forces can be explained as follows:

- The Physical system represents the quality of the human-made environment through which well-being and living standards of people can be determined. It includes aspects like quality of the built environment, infrastructure, accessibility, and the basic level of technology and innovation. Its sub-factors are:
 - Built environment: This is related to the human-made physical surroundings that are necessary for the execution of all normal human activities (living, working, etc.);
 - Technology: This refers to (additional) technological systems and development in the related sector(s);
 - Infrastructure: This indicator refers to the technical infrastructure, e.g. roads, sewage, water, electricity, etc. In addition, it also refers to Internet and telecommunication infrastructure;
 - Accessibility: This is related to the availability and costs of different modes of transportation.
- The Social system is related to the quality of social networks in the case-study area. This consists of the basic level of education and training, but also of coherence, interaction, and the openness of society to new things. The sub-factors are:
 - Social capital: This indicator deals with the basic quality of the social system, e.g. the level of education and skills, but also the gender, age and ethnic distribution;
 - Openness: This is the level of tolerance/interest of citizens with regard to new suggestions and concepts in relation to sustainable development;
 - Participation: This refers to the level of involvement of inhabitants in decision-making processes. It is related to the social dialogue both inside and outside the community with experts and planners;
 - Awareness: This sub-factor is related to the awareness and understanding of society about sustainability and the particular policy in the case study.
- The Economic system refers to the economic activities and their characteristics inside the case-study area. It deals with the level of diversity of sectors, the level of uncertainty in relation to prices or profits, as well as the structure of economic activities by means of the size of the economic activity and its proprietorship.

- Economic diversity: This concerns the number of different economic activities in the case-study area. Even though the case-study area can be focussed on one single sector, other sectors will also be evaluated in relation to economic diversity;
- Uncertainty: This factor refers to the possible impacts of unexpected economic shifts, e.g. economic crisis, price changes.
- The Ecological system is related to both the quality and the quantity of natural environments/ ecosystems of the case-study area, as well as the effect of environmental impacts addressed in the case studies. The sub-factors are:
 - Ecological environment: This sub-factor reflects the quality and quantity (the state) of flora and fauna of the case-study area. Depending on the case study, it may also include parts of the ecological environment which are of interest, e.g. forestry or agriculture;
 - Environmental impacts: This includes factors that enhance or mitigate environmental impacts. Different indicators are possible to assess the environmental impact, e.g. energy consumption, etc.
- The Institutional system represents the quality of administrative and management issues related to the case studies, including quality of political decisions and policy implementation. The sub-factors consist of:
 - Governance structures: This refers to the basic quality of governance structures, related to the interaction between different governmental and institutional stakeholders who influence decisions, the efficiency of the decision-making processes, and also influence how well these decisions are implemented and managed in the case-study area;
 - Integration: This refers to the degree of connectivity and coordination between different policies (and policy makers);
 - Continuity: This refers to the continuity of policies, policy measures and governments.

In the following section, we offer a brief summary of analytical evaluation tools, while focusing on the SMILE toolkit. In addition, we also introduce the critical factors to assess the usefulness of analytical tools for sustainable futures.

3 ANALYTICAL TOOLS FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURES: SMILE TOOLKIT AND ITS USEFULLNESS FACTORS

Investigating a system's performance is by itself a very difficult task, due to the complexity of the problems that are always involved. Adoption of a simplified model is certainly a way to address part of the problem, but this very often leaves another part unsolved. In addition, many investigators run the risk of neglecting the complexity of the problem and take their model as a pseudo-reality. As a consequence, they assign a value to a process or product according to the results of their simplified or stylized investigation. The outcome of this evaluation process is then often used in other subsequent evaluations and translated into economic and policy actions. In doing so, the complexity may get lost: reality does not fit the model and the planned policy fails or is inadequate. For this reason, policies must take indirect effects into account. It is therefore, of paramount importance that a multi-method and multi-scale approach is used when investigating complex systems. Quantifying direct and indirect flows provides a way to measure progress and trends as well as to evaluate if and to what extent a given policy action is successful from the perspective of increased sustainability. Understanding how a given behaviour or policy is likely to affect surrounding

territories and ecosystems may provide a way to mitigate, prevent or compensate adverse effects on the supporting environment.

The ultimate goal of any investigation of a process is to generate a clear picture of the crucial steps, as well as of crucial input and output flows, i.e. those steps and those flows that affect more strongly the process performance. It is possible to focus on these steps and flows, to understand how important they are in the global economy and to suggest changes capable of leading to an improved performance. Some steps may be replaced by alternative patterns, some flows may be decreased by means of a more efficient machinery or sub-processes, and finally some flows may simply be avoided without any important consequence for the final product. Indicators are the result of a calculation procedure where the relevant data are multiplied by intensity factors that are specific for each given method (e.g. oil equivalent factors, transformity, global warming potential, etc). Therefore, when a performance indicator (e.g., the Acidification Potential) is not satisfactory, the analyst goes back to the calculation procedure in order to identify the input items that are responsible for the largest contributions to that impact category and may suggest to decrease their effect by applying more accurate use patterns and technological improvement to the process that delivers a given input (e.g., more efficient production of chemical fertilizers by the chemical industry or electricity by power plants). After the suggested changes have been implemented (or their adoption has been stimulated) in the process, the analyst will recalculate the indicator under consideration and will assess the extent of the performance improvement. Nonetheless, it is very likely that the suggested change affects other impact categories and, due to the reliance on the same set of input data, the improvement in one category might translate into a worse performance in another category (e.g. fuel de-sulphurization – while improving the emissions risk – requires an additional technological process and increased energy input and generates additional waste to dispose of).

Quantifying direct and indirect flows of matter and energy to and from a system permits the construction of a detailed picture of the process itself as well as of its relationship with the surrounding environment. Processing these data in order to calculate performance indicators and material and energetic intensities makes it possible to compare the process output to other products of competing processes. Results may differ depending on the goal, the boundaries, the time scale and the technology and may suggest different optimization procedures. If the analyst is able to provide comprehensive results as well as to explain divergences at the appropriate scales of the investigation, a process can be more easily understood. Conclusions are also reinforced and are more likely to be acceptable for research, application and policy strategies.

Assessing a process performance on different scales offers an effective way to refine the analysis and improve the process. Results from the simultaneous application of a multiple set of methods may yield more consistent and comparable performance indicators and this may call for a two-fold optimization pattern:

1. Upstream: trying to decrease the use of or replace those input flows which more heavily affect the material, energy and environmental support demands;
2. Downstream: trying to decrease the use or avoid the misuse of the investigated product, in order to negatively affect the input demand by controlling the end of the life cycle chain.

It is particularly noteworthy that:

- Several quantitative inputs are affected by significant uncertainty;
- Other factors (e.g. the assessment of Intensity factors) may change over time as a consequence of production choices or technological improvement;
- Many flows and results may be correlated to each other, implying the risk of non-linearity and feedback effects, which can significantly alter the results of the quantitative assessment.

On the basis of the above concerns about investigating a systemic process like sustainable development, a toolkit, the so-called SMILE toolkit developed within an earlier undertaken project coined DECOIN, was extended and further implemented in the SMILE project, leading to the SMILE toolkit. The toolkit is designed to generate effective multi-purpose grammars to be used for representing and studying “sustainability issues” in an integrated manner, across different dimensions and scales of analysis. The toolkit has to be adapted, case by case, to the specific characteristics of the sustainability problem to be tackled. It is obvious that not just a single protocol (‘one size fits all’) can be used. The application of the toolkit (which type of approach to use and for which purpose) has to be tailored both on: (i) the specific goal of each case study; and (ii) the specific characteristics of the system investigated.

The SMILE toolkit aims at helping the EU and its Member States to better observe trends in relation to different dimensions of sustainability. Within the SMILE project, the toolkit is applied to a selection of case-studies that are society dominated complex systems (environmental, agricultural, industrial, whole economies) in order to test the potential of the toolkit for a multidimensional assessment of the system’s dynamics and its sustainability. The case-studies that are the subject to our research are very diverse in terms of their sustainability issues, aims, stakeholders and scales. This is summarized in Table 1 to show better the complexity and diversity of our sample of five cases in five different countries .

Table 1 Summary of the case-studies

Case	Aim	Scale	Sustainability Aspects		
			Social	Ecological	Economic
Finland	Forest ecosystem	National	No stakeholder involvement	Quality and well-being of ecosystems	To increase productivity and labour intensity of the forest sector
Italy	Agriculture sector	Local; Regional; National	Individual farms; Inclusion of stakeholders at different scales	Analysis of the amount and the quality of resources; Environmental impact; Analysis of decomposition equations for CO ₂ emissions and the non-renewable emergency fraction	To enable policy makers to provide some incentives; To be able to collaborate with the local market operators
Romania	Energy sector	National	Issue-related ministries; Households; Action groups; Local authorities; Companies	The environmental impact of different energy consumptions.	To reveal the gaps between the Romanian economy and the economy of other EU Member states
Scotland	Cairngorms National Park (CNP)	Regional	CNP Authority; National stakeholders; Regional stakeholders; Local stakeholders	Landscape: Built and Historic Environment; Biodiversity; Geodiversity; Sustainable Use of Resources; Energy; Water; Air	To make tourism and businesses more sustainable To make housing more affordable and sustainable
Spain	Toolkit		No specific operational information on sustainability is available.		

The case-studies in our sample have several similarities; the main similarity is that their general approach is sustainability-oriented. The sustainability issues are mainly based on ecological and economic aspects of sustainability. Except for the Spanish case-study, all case-studies are sectorally focused. The Spanish case-study is the most distinctive one among the case-studies. It deals with the toolkit itself and not with a specific aspect of sustainability. Instead, it is very useful in providing the relation of the output of the toolkit with sustainability issues. The case-studies have several scales. Some deal with the national scale, while there are also case-studies focusing on local or regional scales. Within the Spanish and Finnish case-studies, stakeholders are not involved in the analysis process while the output of both cases is useful for many stakeholders.

The key element in the toolkit is the integration of three evaluation frameworks into one multi-criteria, multi-scale and versatile prototype framework for the assessment of complex systems. The Advanced Sustainability Analysis (ASA), the Multi-Scale Integrated Analysis of Societal and Ecosystem Metabolism (MUSIASEM) and the Sustainability Multi-method Multi-scale Assessment (SUMMA) approaches are integrated into a tool, which is easy to use and provides reporting features that are required for monitoring and policy making. The separate tools are described below.

ASA²: Advanced Sustainability Analysis (ASA) is a mathematical information system developed by Finland Futures Research Centre (see e.g. Malaska et al 1999; Kaivo-oja et al 2001a; 2001b; Vehmas et al 2003; Luukkanen et al 2005; Vehmas 2009). It can be used to analyze sustainable development from different points of view. ASA analysis can provide quantitative information on the changes and reasons for change of quantitative sustainability indicators from various dimensions of sustainability. What is required is quantitative time-series data on the explained sustainability indicators and other related indicators that form the factors into which the changes in explained sustainability indicators can be subdivided, or decomposed. This requires, in turn an understanding of the explained sustainability indicators and forces relevant to its change. If the quantified data is available, the ASA method is very flexible and can quantify the contributions of factors of change in sustainability indicators in all relevant fields e.g., physical, social, economic, ecological, and institutional). Obviously, the challenge is, firstly, the availability of quantitative time-series data on the sustainability indicators and the relevant other variables constructing the contributing factors, and secondly, forming the ASA decomposition equation with sensible interpretations from the available indicator data. In order to improve the usability and value of the toolkit, a lot of attention should be given to the quality of the time series selected.

MUSIASEM³: The MuSIASEM approach (originally proposed as MSIASM by Giampietro and Mayumi, 2000a; 2000b; Giampietro 2003a) has been developed in relation to the emerging field of science for governance. In particular it can be seen as an attempt to generate a methodological approach capable of providing a quality control on quantitative analyses applied to the issue of sustainability. It is based on the seminal idea of “bioeconomics” put forward by Georgescu-Roegen (Mayumi, 2001) and on the conceptual tool of multi-purpose grammar proposed within complex systems theory as a key ingredient for the possibility of getting informed autocatalytic loop (autopiesis) by Kauffman (1993). MuSIASEM can be used to check the robustness and the relevance of models, datasets, and

² Ibid.

³ This is retrieved from the SMILE deliverable D3.

forecasting. It achieves this result by verifying the congruence of the chosen integrated representation of parts and the whole across scales in relation to the set of constraints implied by the different dimensions of analysis (referred to as the Sudoku effect). That is, it can integrate biophysical, economic, social, demographic and land-use analyses across different hierarchical levels and scales. This integration makes it possible to check the coherence of quantitative characterizations of scenarios across non-equivalent descriptive domains.

SUMMA⁴: The comprehensive evaluation method SUMMA (Sustainability Multimethod Multiscale Assessment) is used as a support to decision-making. In SUMMA, the different (upstream and downstream) perspectives are not forced to be combined, but retain their full wealth of information, on the basis of which wise decisions can be made, also taking into account important external factors such as social and economic welfare. SUMMA is based on a selection of upstream and downstream methods, which offer complementary points of view on the complex issue of environmental impact and performance assessment.

Since SUMMA (as Life Cycle Analysis (LCA) in general) is based on a single common inventory (LCI) of all the system's inputs and outputs, a systematic sensitivity analysis can be simultaneously performed on all calculated data and indicators. In the present study we created in our spreadsheet-based calculation procedure a set of variable cells to which it is possible to assign percentage variations to all input quantities as well as to the values of associated characterization coefficients (intensity factors). Such a procedure is very valuable in order to estimate the actual reliability of the impact assessment itself, accounting for the inevitable uncertainties and variability in the input data and/or intensity factors, as well as to single out the most critical key points of the analyzed process, in the light of different assessment methods.

One of the potential uses of the sensitivity analysis applied to the LCA/SUMMA approach is to provide informed advice for governance (to policy makers, managers, institutions) by highlighting different scenarios of the investigated systems as a consequence of policy actions. Changes calculated or foreseen for performance indicators only tell what would happen to the performance if input flows change for any reason. They do not indicate the economic and social constraints in which the system operates, nor do they systematically assess the reasons, the drivers of the occurred or foreseen performance drop (or improvement). The time series related to the system's behaviour in the past or the series constructed based on assumptions (e.g. assuming that fuel efficiency improves by 2% every year) are then processed by the MUSIASEM approach (second step of the toolkit) in order to detect the social and economic constraints (e.g. how a given solution affects the individual income or the fraction of working population); then, time series of input flows and performance indicators are also processed by ASA, in order to decompose the performance into decomposition ratios, each indicating a driver of the change (e.g. labour intensity, energy productivity, etc). In so doing, after calculating past and future performance indicators according to a number of biophysical criteria and methods, the feasibility of solutions from an economic and social point of view is assessed (MUSIASEM) and the main drivers are identified (in particular, the nature of these drivers in the past and the way they should be characterized in order to reach a planned performance in the future.

⁴ This is retrieved from the Smile deliverable D4 Demonstration - example for each of the DECOIN tools.

As a consequence of the sequential application of SUMMA, MUSIASEM and ASA (the DECOIN toolkit), policy making is provided with a series of performance indicators, their evolution over time, their improvement potential based on higher individual or technological efficiency, socio-economic constraints to planned actions and finally drivers of change based on decomposition analysis, interlinkages and synergies.

The SMILE toolkit was designed and formulated to test and highlight the pros and cons of an innovative procedure capable of generating multi-scale indicators (embracing the three approaches of the toolkit). This procedure, when fully developed, should later on be used to tailor the representation of the sustainability predicament “a la carte” on the issue definition given by social actors.

4 THE USEFULNESS OF THE ANALYSIS TOOLS TO SUSTAINABLE FUTURES

4.1 Approach and Methodology

We will investigate in this section the usefulness of the SMILE toolkit. To reach our aim, we present a ‘usefulness method’ that uses critical factors of sustainable development when determining the usefulness of the toolkit using an outranking method. It is basically an impact structure matrix, which reflects the impacts of policy measures (Nijkamp, 1983). During our evaluation, we employ the success and failure factors of the toolkit and the sustainability pentagon factors.

In general terms, our consortium SMILE addresses the interfaces between scientific achievements in sustainability analysis and the various user categories and interest groups that are either involved in sustainable development or that are interested or involved in the development of SMILE toolkit. To assess the usefulness of the toolkit, we conducted interviews among experts who somehow experienced the SMILE toolkit. Altogether, 11 experts from different case-studies participated in our research in March 2010. The collected data is processed in four steps by the use of the impact matrix methodology. These four steps are:

Step 1 – Definition of critical factors: During this step, the critical factors of sustainable development and the critical factors related to the use of the toolkit are defined. These factors are used as the criteria to formulate the impact matrix (see Subsection 4.2).

Step 2 – Ranking of sustainability factors: secondly we calculate the ranking of factors of sustainability and of the toolkit separately and ranked them without taking into account any causal relations (see Subsection 4.3).

Step 3 – Impact matrix: The third step is related to the formulation of the impact matrix. During this step, first we define the consistent relations between the factors of sustainable development and of the toolkit. Later, we score these relations and calculate their weights (see Subsection 4.4).

Step 4 – Assessment: The fourth and the last step is to evaluate our findings and to assess the usefulness of our toolkit (see Subsection 4.5).

4.2 Critical Factors of Analytical Tools

The critical factors of sustainable development are given in the previous sections in details. Therefore, in this sub-section we provide only the critical factors of the toolkit. While evaluating the critical factors for the toolkit, a questionnaire applied in each of the case-study was very useful and guided us. The aim was basically to gather the opinion of stakeholders on whether the outcome of the toolkit represents a useful and interesting input for a discussion among stakeholders within the policy arena and on the applicability and advantages of such a toolkit. Our findings are:

- the results – and to understand the results – are very important for stakeholders to be involved in the decision making process,
- there is a need to reflect without oversimplifying the complexity of systems, and hence the composition of the data is important.

On the basis of the above mentioned-research and the opinion of the toolkit users, in order to assess the usefulness of the toolkit, the five success and failure factors and their sub-factors are:

- **Data Requirements:** This factor refers to the data and resources needed for the application of the SMILE toolkit in order to obtain reliable assessments of the scientific output.
 - Reliability: The reliability of the data
 - Availability: The availability of reliable data
 - Access: Access to reliable data by the researchers/users
 - Generation: Possibilities for data generation when information is missing
 - Hidden data: The hidden data related to the informal economy etc.
- **Output:** This relates to the output provided as the result of the methods of the toolkit. Its sub-factors are:
 - Visual: This reflects to the visual output such as tables, graphs, diagrams, histograms and figures, etc.
 - Numerical: This reflects to the output, such as scores, percentages, rankings etc.
- **Support System:** This factor refers to the contribution of administrative units to help and assist direct and indirect users of the toolkit and to increase their understanding of the toolkit.
 - Perception: This refers to the perception of the supporting administrative units and their (initial) positive or negative thoughts about the toolkit.
 - Experience: This refers to the contribution of administrative units to assist the users to experience the toolkit.
 - Collaboration: This means the contribution of administrative units to ease the access to their data and to apply the results.
- **Users:** This factor refers to the direct and indirect users and their attitude towards the toolkit. Therefore, its decomposition is:
 - Awareness: This refers to the awareness of possible users about the toolkit and the usefulness/benefits of the toolkit, the knowledge of possible users and their understanding of the toolkit.
 - Demand: This refers to the existence of demand for the output/results of the toolkit by the users.
 - Expectations: This deals with the expectations of users from the toolkit.
 - Willingness: This is the willingness of users to understand and use the toolkit.
 - Networks: This means the networks of users which will help to the spread of the toolkit.
- **Technology:** This factor refers to the technology of the toolkit itself and also to technologies required to use the toolkit. Its decomposition is:

- Software language: The language of the toolkit is very important to use the toolkit. The possible users may prefer to use the toolkit in their maternal language. Therefore, the language of the toolkit can have a critical role.
- Specifications: This refers to the technological needs and infrastructure required for the use of the toolkit.

In the following sub-section, we rank the critical factors of the toolkit and sustainable development while weightening each critical factor.

4.3 Ranking of Sustainability Factors

Our assessment by means of the toolkit consists of critical factors as defined above. But, before constructing the impact matrix, first we calculate the ranking and scores of the factors of sustainable development and the toolkit separately from the perspective of scientific users of the toolkit. This calculation is the second step of our evaluation.

The results of the scoring and ranking process show that experts rank the sustainability systems as: ecological system, institutional system, social system, physical system and economic system respectively (Table 2). In addition, the ranking of the toolkit is output, data, users, support and technology, respectively (Table 2). The scores range between 0 and 5 and they are calculated as the average of the total scores of all stakeholders.

Table 2 Scores and ranking of critical factors

<i>Sustainability factors</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Toolkit factors</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
Physical system	3.6	4	Data	4.0	2
Social system	3.6	3	Support	3.3	4
Economic system	3.2	5	Output	4.3	1
Ecological system	4.5	1	Users	3.5	3
Institutional system	3.9	2	Technology	3.0	5

The critical nature of a factor depends on the criticality of its decomposition. This means that the weights are the clarification of the criticality of factors compared with each other (Akgün et al., 2011). Therefore, the two types of weights allow us to better understand whether the defined factors are seen as robustly critical from the point of view of different experts. Although, we have calculated an equally-weighted (EW) and weighted (W) scale based on the interviews, the results show that the rankings are very robust as both types of ranking are the same. The results show the robustness of our analysis and the criticality ranking of the factors, and therefore, we omitted the weighted scores in our analysis.

4.4 Specification of the Impact Matrix

An impact matrix is a summary of the impacts of issues on each other in a tabular form. In our case, the columns represent the factors of the toolkit while the rows represent the sustainable development factors (Table 3). Scores are only calculated for the consistent causal relationships which are mentioned in Table 4 and obtained from the interviews.

Table 3 The impact matrix of toolkit factors by sustainability factors

	Score				
	Data	Support	Output	Users	Technology
Physical	3.55			2.95	2.90
Social	3.70	3.75		3.75	3.20
Economic	2.95			3.05	
Ecological	4.00			3.75	
Institutional	3.55	3.40		3.35	
	Weight				
	Data	Support	Output	Users	Technology
Physical	0.13			0.02	0.05
Social	0.15	0.10		0.16	0.10
Economic	0.05			0.04	
Ecological	0.25			0.10	
Institutional	0.05	0.06		0.05	

Table 4 Consistent causal relations of sustainability and toolkit sub-factors

<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Toolkit sub-factors</i>
Physical	
Built-Environment	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users)
Technology	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users); Willingness(Users); Networks(Users); Software Language (Technology)
Infrastructure	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users); Willingness(Users); Networks(Users); Software Language (Technology)
Accessibility	Reliability (Data)
Social	
Social Capital	Reliability (Data); Perception (Support); Awareness (Users); Demand(Users); Willingness(Users); Networks(Users); Software Language (Technology)
Openness	Reliability (Data); Perception (Support); Awareness (Users); Demand(Users); Willingness(Users); Networks(Users); Software Language (Technology)
Participation	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users); Willingness(Users); Networks(Users)
Awareness	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users)
Economic	
Economic Diversity	Willingness(Users)
Uncertainty	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users); Willingness(Users); Networks(Users)
Ecological	
Ecoquantity	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users)
Ecoimpact	Reliability (Data); Demand(Users)
Institutional	
Governance	Reliability (Data); Perception (Support); Experience(Support); Collaboration(Support); Demand(Users)
Integration	Perception (Support); Experience(Support); Collaboration(Support); Demand(Users)
Continuity	Reliability (Data); Perception (Support); Experience(Support); Collaboration(Support)

The causal relations are identified in relation to the toolkit and its requirements. There are 272 possible combinations between sustainability and toolkit sub-factors, However, the meaningful causal relations are only 55 of them. The meaningful causal relations are shown in Table 4. As can be seen from the table, not each sustainability sub-factor and toolkit sub-factor is represented in the consistent causal relations.

At a first glance, even though we cannot show a consistent causal relation, the toolkit is very effective for sustainable development. As mentioned earlier, the toolkit is valid and very useful for environmental experts so we see this also in our assessment that the highest contribution in terms of data reliability and the user demand of the toolkit is to the ecological systems.

4.5 Assessment

We can state that the SMILE toolkit has an indirect positive effect on sustainable development. Below we offer the assessment of the usefulness of the SMILE toolkit for sustainable development. To understand better the assessment of the impact matrix and the impact of the toolkit on the sustainable development, we visualized our results by spider diagrams based on the above mentioned pentagon approach. In the diagrams we have omitted the output factor, as this does not have a direct consistent causal relationship. But, early research have proven the criticality of the output in order to explain the results to the different types of stakeholders and to show the real usefulness of the analytical tools.

According to the equally weighted scores shown in Figure 1, we can easily see that the causal relations are very effective for each component of the sustainable development. All toolkit factors have an impact on the ecological system first. The main contribution and usefulness of the toolkit is the assessment of the ecological system. Changes in the ecological system are difficult to investigate and to predict. In addition, among the toolkit factors, users and data contribute to the evaluation of the economic system. However, the contribution of the toolkit to the economic system is smaller than its contribution to the assessment of other sustainability factors.




Figure 1 Assessment of the impact matrix - Equally weighted scores of consistent relations

In order to test the robustness of our impact matrix, we also evaluated the impact matrix with the weighted factors (Figure 2). The results of the impact matrix by weighted scores show that our analysis is robust, as the ranking of the sustainability factors by the toolkit remains the same in terms of consistent causal relations. In other words, the main contribution of the toolkit is the assessment of the ecological system, followed by social systems. In addition, our analysis is sensitive in terms of its contribution to the economic system.




Figure 2 Assessment of the impact matrix – Weighted scores consistent relations

The results show that the contribution of the toolkit to improve our insight into sustainable development and policy implications is obviously important in terms of non-economic issues. Moreover, the results also demonstrate that the impact of the toolkit on the economic system depends on the users and the way they use the toolkit.

5 CONCLUSION

The pluriformity and multiplicity of sustainable development leads to complex systems that are difficult to overcome. Thus, integrated approaches need to better understand sustainable development and to better deal with uncertain futures. Therefore, the SMILE toolkit is one of the successful analytical toolkits developed for sustainability analysis. In this paper, we stress the usefulness of the toolkit, but meanwhile we also want to show the importance of the critical properties of the toolkit.

Both the toolkit and the results of the toolkit impact matrix have shown the usefulness of the toolkit to obtain fresh insights for sustainable development. Although the toolkit is successful, more improvement is needed to increase the usage of the toolkit for a wider group of users. In other words, although the toolkit is successful in dealing with complex systems, the most important aspect that should be improved to make them useful for different groups of stakeholders is to present the output as understandable and accessible as possible. Therefore, toolkit developers should pay as much attention to the input as to the output of the toolkit.

Acknowledgement: This study is an outcome of the FP7 EU-project SMILE. The authors wish to thank the partners of the SMILE consortium for their input.

References

- Akgün, A.A., van Leeuwen, E.S. and Nijkamp P. 2011. A Systemic Perspective on Multi-Stakeholder Sustainable Development Strategies. In *Governance Development and Conflict* by M. Chatterji, D. Gopal and S. Singh (eds), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley/GB.
- Button, K. 1998. The good, the bad and the forgettable — or lessons the US can learn from European transport policy. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 6(1), 285-294.
- Buzan, T. 2003. The mind map book, BBC active, London.
- Cortner, H.J. 2000. Making science relevant to environmental policy. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 1 (3), pp. 21-30.
- Daly, H. 1996. *Beyond growth: the economics of sustainable development*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press. pp. 7.
- De Bono, E. 1973. *Lateral thinking. Creativity step by step formation*, Graphic press.
- DiMicco, J.M., Pandolfo, A. and Bender, W. 2004. Influencing group participation with a shared display. ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work (CSCW).
- Eppler, M. J. and Platts, K. W. 2009. Visual Strategizing, The systematic use of visualization in the strategic-planning process. *Long Range Planning*. 42, pp. 42-74.
- European Commission (EC). 2010. Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination-a new political framework for tourism in Europe. Brussels
- Giampietro, M. and Mayumi, K. 2003. An alternative energy analysis based on complex systems thinking (2): acknowledging the existence of hierarchies, scales and impredicative loops. In *Advances in Energy Studies (3): Reconsidering the importance of Energy*, S. Ulgiati, M. Brown, M. Giampietro, R. Herendeen and K. Mayumi (Eds). Servizi Grafici Editoriali, Padova. pp. 553-561.
- Giampietro, M., Mayumi, K. and Pastore, G. 2000a. Socioeconomic systems as complex self-organizing adaptive holarchies: The dynamic exergy budget. In *Unifying Themes in Complex Systems*, Yaneer Bar-Yam (eds.), New England Complex Systems Institute Series on Complexity. Perseus Books, Cambridge. pp. 209-219.
- Giampietro, M., Pastore, G. and Mayumi, K. 2000b. Socioeconomic systems as nested dissipative adaptive systems (holarchies) and their dynamic energy budget: validation of the approach. In *Unifying Themes in Complex Systems*, Yaneer Bar-Yam (eds.), New England Complex Systems Institute Series on Complexity. Perseus Books, Cambridge. Pp.223-232.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91 (3), 481-510.
- Gülümser, A.A., van Leeuwen E. and Nijkamp P. 2009. Synergies in multi-scale inter-linkages of eco-social system (SMILE), Stakeholder-based pentagon models, deliverable 19
- Gülümser, A.A. 2009. *Rural Areas as Promising Hot Spots: Sustainable Rural Development Scenarios*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Institute of Science and Technology, Istanbul Technical University.
- Harvey, D. 1969. *Explanation in Geography*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Hernes, G. 1976. Structural change in social processes. *American Journal of Sociology*, 3, pp.513-547.
- Hinloopen, E., Nijkamp, P. and Rietveld, P., 1983. Qualitative discrete multiple criteria choice models in regional planning. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 13, pp. 77-102.
- Huff, A. 1990. Mapping strategic thought, Wiley, London.
- Hwang, A. 2000. Toward fostering systems learning in organizational contexts, *Syst. Pract. Action Res.* 13 (3), pp. 329-343.
- Kaivo-oja, J., J. Luukkanen and P. Malaska. 2001a. Advanced sustainability analysis. In *Our Fragile World – Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable Development. Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems and Sustainable Development*, M. K. Tolba, (eds). EOLSS Publishers, Oxford.
- Kaivo-oja, J., J. Luukkanen and P. Malaska. 2001b. Sustainability Evaluation Frameworks and Alternative Analytical Scenarios of National Economies. *Population and Environment - A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 23(2), pp. 193-215.

- Kauffman, S.A. 1993 *The Origins of Order: self-organization and selection in evolution*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lubchenco, J. 1998. Entering the century of the environment: a new social contract for science. *Science*, 279, pp. 491-397.
- Lurie, N. H. and Mason, C. H. 2007. Visual representation: implications for decision-making, *Journal of Marketing*, 71, pp. 160-177.
- Luukkanen, J., Vehmas, J., Kinnunen, V., Kuntsi-Reunanen, E., Kaivo-oja, J. 2005. Converging CO2 Emissions to Equal Per Capita Levels – Mission Possible? Finland Futures Research Centre, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, FFRC Publications 2/2005. Turku.
- Maasen, S. M. Lengwiler., and Guggenheim, M. 2006. Introduction: Practices of transdisciplinary research: close(r) encounters of science and society. *Science and Public Policy*, 33(6), pp.394-398.
- Malaska, P., Kaivo-oja, J., Luukkanen, J. 1999. Sustainability and Economic Growth: A Theoretical Framework and Empirical Demonstrations. Futu-publication 4/99. Finland Futures Research Centre. Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Turku.
- Mayumi, K. 2001. *The Origins of Ecological Economics: The Bioeconomics of Georgescu-Roegen*. Routledge, London.
- Nijkamp, P. 1983. Qualitative Spatial Impact analysis. In *Spatial, Environmental and Resource Policy in the Developing Countries*, M. Chatterji, P. Nijkamp, T.R. Lakshmanan and C.R. Pathak (eds). Gower, Aldershot. pp 178-187.
- Nijkamp, P. and Pepping, G. 1998. A Meta-analytical Evaluation of Sustainable City Initiatives. *Urban Studies*, 35 (9), 1481-1500.
- Nijkamp, P. and Yim, H.Y. 2001. Critical Success Factors for Offshore Airports: A Comparative Evaluation. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 7, 181-188
- Nijkamp, P. 2008. XXQ factors for sustainable urban development: a system economics view, *Romanian Journal of Regional Science*, 2 (1), 1-34.
- Nijkamp, P., Vleugel, J., Maggi, R. and Masser, I. 1994. *Missing Transport Networks in Europe*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Nijkamp, P., Rietveld, P., and Voogd, H. 1990. *Multicriteria analysis for physical planning*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Sachs, I., 1997. *L'écodéveloppement/Stratégies pour le XXIe siècle*, Paris: Syros.
- United Nations (UN), 1996. *Indicators of sustainable development: framework and methodologies*. New York: UN.
- Vehmas, J. 2009. Decomposition analysis of CO2 emissions from fuel combustion in selected countries. *International Journal of Environmental Technology and Management*, 11, pp.47-67.
- Vehmas, J., Malaska, P., Luukkanen, J., Kaivo-oja, J., Vinnari, O., Hietanen, M., Ilvonen J. 2003. Europe in the Global Battle of Sustainability: Rebound Strikes Back? Advanced Sustainability Analysis. Publications of the Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Series Discussion and Working Papers 7:2003.
- Vessey, I. 1991. Cognitive fit: a theory-based analysis of the graphs versus tables literature. *Decision Sciences*. 22, pp. 219-241.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), 1987. *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University.

2009-1	Boriana Rukanova Rolf T. Wignand Yao-Hua Tan	From national to supranational government inter-organizational systems: An extended typology, 33 p.
2009-2	Marc D. Bahlmann Marleen H. Huysman Tom Elfring Peter Groenewegen	Global Pipelines or global buzz? A micro-level approach towards the knowledge-based view of clusters, 33 p.
2009-3	Julie E. Ferguson Marleen H. Huysman	Between ambition and approach: Towards sustainable knowledge management in development organizations, 33 p.
2009-4	Mark G. Leijssen	Why empirical cost functions get scale economies wrong, 11 p.
2009-5	Peter Nijkamp Galit Cohen-Blankshtain	The importance of ICT for cities: e-governance and cyber perceptions, 14 p.
2009-6	Eric de Noronha Vaz Mário Caetano Peter Nijkamp	Trapped between antiquity and urbanism. A multi-criteria assessment model of the greater Cairo metropolitan area, 22 p.
2009-7	Eric de Noronha Vaz Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Spatial analysis for policy evaluation of the rural world: Portuguese agriculture in the last decade, 16 p.
2009-8	Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Multitasking in the rural world: Technological change and sustainability, 20 p.
2009-9	Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Vincenzo Torrieri Peter Nijkamp	An operational information systems architecture for assessing sustainable transportation planning: Principles and design, 17 p.
2009-10	Vincenzo Del Giudice Pierfrancesco De Paola Francesca Torrieri Francesca Pagliari Peter Nijkamp	A decision support system for real estate investment choice, 16 p.
2009-11	Miruna Mazurencu Marinescu Peter Nijkamp	IT companies in rough seas: Predictive factors for bankruptcy risk in Romania, 13 p.
2009-12	Boriana Rukanova Helle Zinner Hendriksen Eveline van Stijn Yao-Hua Tan	Bringing is innovation in a highly-regulated environment: A collective action perspective, 33 p.
2009-13	Patricia van Hemert Peter Nijkamp Jolanda Verbraak	Evaluating social science and humanities knowledge production: an exploratory analysis of dynamics in science systems, 20 p.

2009-14	Roberto Patuelli Aura Reggiani Peter Nijkamp Norbert Schanne	Neural networks for cross-sectional employment forecasts: A comparison of model specifications for Germany, 15 p.
2009-15	André de Waal Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	The relationship between the level of completeness of a strategic performance management system and perceived advantages and disadvantages, 19 p.
2009-16	Vincenzo Punzo Vincenzo Torrieri Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Biagio Ciuffo Peter Nijkamp	Modelling intermodal re-balance and integration: planning a sub-lagoon tube for Venezia, 24 p.
2009-17	Peter Nijkamp Roger Stough Mediha Sahin	Impact of social and human capital on business performance of migrant entrepreneurs – a comparative Dutch-US study, 31 p.
2009-18	Dres Creal	A survey of sequential Monte Carlo methods for economics and finance, 54 p.
2009-19	Karima Kourtit André de Waal	Strategic performance management in practice: Advantages, disadvantages and reasons for use, 15 p.
2009-20	Karima Kourtit André de Waal Peter Nijkamp	Strategic performance management and creative industry, 17 p.
2009-21	Eric de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Historico-cultural sustainability and urban dynamics – a geo-information science approach to the Algarve area, 25 p.
2009-22	Roberta Capello Peter Nijkamp	Regional growth and development theories revisited, 19 p.
2009-23	M. Francesca Cracolici Miranda Cuffaro Peter Nijkamp	Tourism sustainability and economic efficiency – a statistical analysis of Italian provinces, 14 p.
2009-24	Caroline A. Rodenburg Peter Nijkamp Henri L.F. de Groot Erik T. Verhoef	Valuation of multifunctional land use by commercial investors: A case study on the Amsterdam Zuidas mega-project, 21 p.
2009-25	Katrin Oltmer Peter Nijkamp Raymond Florax Floor Brouwer	Sustainability and agri-environmental policy in the European Union: A meta-analytic investigation, 26 p.
2009-26	Francesca Torrieri Peter Nijkamp	Scenario analysis in spatial impact assessment: A methodological approach, 20 p.
2009-27	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder: A logistic regression analysis of sustainability and locality as competitive vehicles for human settlements, 14 p.

2009-28	Marco Percoco Peter Nijkamp	Individual time preferences and social discounting in environmental projects, 24 p.
2009-29	Peter Nijkamp Maria Abreu	Regional development theory, 12 p.
2009-30	Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	7 FAQs in urban planning, 22 p.
2009-31	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Turkey's rurality: A comparative analysis at the EU level, 22 p.
2009-32	Frank Bruinsma Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	An agent-based decision support model for the development of e-services in the tourist sector, 21 p.
2009-33	Mediha Sahin Peter Nijkamp Marius Rietdijk	Cultural diversity and urban innovativeness: Personal and business characteristics of urban migrant entrepreneurs, 27 p.
2009-34	Peter Nijkamp Mediha Sahin	Performance indicators of urban migrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands, 28 p.
2009-35	Manfred M. Fischer Peter Nijkamp	Entrepreneurship and regional development, 23 p.
2009-36	Faroek Lazrak Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld Jan Rouwendal	Cultural heritage and creative cities: An economic evaluation perspective, 20 p.
2009-37	Enno Masurel Peter Nijkamp	Bridging the gap between institutions of higher education and small and medium-size enterprises, 32 p.
2009-38	Francesca Medda Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Dynamic effects of external and private transport costs on urban shape: A morphogenetic perspective, 17 p.
2009-39	Roberta Capello Peter Nijkamp	Urban economics at a cross-yard: Recent theoretical and methodological directions and future challenges, 16 p.
2009-40	Enno Masurel Peter Nijkamp	The low participation of urban migrant entrepreneurs: Reasons and perceptions of weak institutional embeddedness, 23 p.
2009-41	Patricia van Hemert Peter Nijkamp	Knowledge investments, business R&D and innovativeness of countries. A qualitative meta-analytic comparison, 25 p.
2009-42	Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Knowledge and innovation: The strings between global and local dimensions of sustainable growth, 16 p.
2009-43	Chiara M. Travisi Peter Nijkamp	Managing environmental risk in agriculture: A systematic perspective on the potential of quantitative policy-oriented risk valuation, 19 p.
2009-44	Sander de Leeuw	Logistics aspects of emergency preparedness in flood disaster prevention, 24 p.

Iris F.A. Vis
Sebastiaan B. Jonkman

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 2009-45 | Eveline S. van Leeuwen
Peter Nijkamp | Social accounting matrices. The development and application of SAMs at the local level, 26 p. |
| 2009-46 | Tibert Verhagen
Willemijn van Dolen | The influence of online store characteristics on consumer impulsive decision-making: A model and empirical application, 33 p. |
| 2009-47 | Eveline van Leeuwen
Peter Nijkamp | A micro-simulation model for e-services in cultural heritage tourism, 23 p. |
| 2009-48 | Andrea Caragliu
Chiara Del Bo
Peter Nijkamp | Smart cities in Europe, 15 p. |
| 2009-49 | Farook Lazrak
Peter Nijkamp
Piet Rietveld
Jan Rouwendal | Cultural heritage: Hedonic prices for non-market values, 11 p. |
| 2009-50 | Eric de Noronha Vaz
João Pedro Bernardes
Peter Nijkamp | Past landscapes for the reconstruction of Roman land use: Eco-history tourism in the Algarve, 23 p. |
| 2009-51 | Eveline van Leeuwen
Peter Nijkamp
Teresa de Noronha Vaz | The Multi-functional use of urban green space, 12 p. |
| 2009-52 | Peter Bakker
Carl Koopmans
Peter Nijkamp | Appraisal of integrated transport policies, 20 p. |
| 2009-53 | Luca De Angelis
Leonard J. Paas | The dynamics analysis and prediction of stock markets through the latent Markov model, 29 p. |
| 2009-54 | Jan Anne Annema
Carl Koopmans | Een lastige praktijk: Ervaringen met waarderen van omgevingskwaliteit in de kosten-batenanalyse, 17 p. |
| 2009-55 | Bas Straathof
Gert-Jan Linders | Europe's internal market at fifty: Over the hill? 39 p. |
| 2009-56 | Joaquim A.S. Gromicho
Jelke J. van Hoorn
Francisco Saldanha-da-Gama
Gerrit T. Timmer | Exponentially better than brute force: solving the job-shop scheduling problem optimally by dynamic programming, 14 p. |
| 2009-57 | Carmen Lee
Roman Kraeussl
Leo Paas | The effect of anticipated and experienced regret and pride on investors' future selling decisions, 31 p. |
| 2009-58 | René Sitters | Efficient algorithms for average completion time scheduling, 17 p. |

2009-59	Masood Gheasi Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Migration and tourist flows, 20 p.
---------	---	------------------------------------

2010-1	Roberto Patuelli Norbert Schanne Daniel A. Griffith Peter Nijkamp	Persistent disparities in regional unemployment: Application of a spatial filtering approach to local labour markets in Germany, 28 p.
2010-2	Thomas de Graaff Ghebre Debrezion Piet Rietveld	Schaalsprong Almere. Het effect van bereikbaarheidsverbeteringen op de huizenprijzen in Almere, 22 p.
2010-3	John Steenbruggen Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Peter Nijkamp Henk Scholten	Real-time data from mobile phone networks for urban incidence and traffic management – a review of application and opportunities, 23 p.
2010-4	Marc D. Bahlmann Tom Elfring Peter Groenewegen Marleen H. Huysman	Does distance matter? An ego-network approach towards the knowledge-based theory of clusters, 31 p.
2010-5	Jelke J. van Hoorn	A note on the worst case complexity for the capacitated vehicle routing problem, 3 p.
2010-6	Mark G. Lijesen	Empirical applications of spatial competition; an interpretative literature review, 16 p.
2010-7	Carmen Lee Roman Kraeussl Leo Paas	Personality and investment: Personality differences affect investors' adaptation to losses, 28 p.
2010-8	Nahom Ghebrihiwet Evgenia Motchenkova	Leniency programs in the presence of judicial errors, 21 p.
2010-9	Meindert J. Flikkema Ard-Pieter de Man Matthijs Wolters	New trademark registration as an indicator of innovation: results of an explorative study of Benelux trademark data, 53 p.
2010-10	Jani Merikivi Tibert Verhagen Frans Feldberg	Having belief(s) in social virtual worlds: A decomposed approach, 37 p.
2010-11	Umut Kilingç	Price-cost markups and productivity dynamics of entrant plants, 34 p.
2010-12	Umut Kilingç	Measuring competition in a frictional economy, 39 p.

2011-1	Yoshifumi Takahashi Peter Nijkamp	Multifunctional agricultural land use in sustainable world, 25 p.
2011-2	Paulo A.L.D. Nunes Peter Nijkamp	Biodiversity: Economic perspectives, 37 p.
2011-3	Eric de Noronha Vaz Doan Nainggolan Peter Nijkamp Marco Painho	A complex spatial systems analysis of tourism and urban sprawl in the Algarve, 23 p.
2011-4	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Strangers on the move. Ethnic entrepreneurs as urban change actors, 34 p.
2011-5	Manie Geyer Helen C. Coetzee Danie Du Plessis Ronnie Donaldson Peter Nijkamp	Recent business transformation in intermediate-sized cities in South Africa, 30 p.
2011-6	Aki Kangasharju Christophe Tavera Peter Nijkamp	Regional growth and unemployment. The validity of Okun's law for the Finnish regions, 17 p.
2011-7	Amitrajeet A. Batabyal Peter Nijkamp	A Schumpeterian model of entrepreneurship, innovation, and regional economic growth, 30 p.
2011-8	Aliye Ahu Akgün Tüzin Baycan Levent Peter Nijkamp	The engine of sustainable rural development: Embeddedness of entrepreneurs in rural Turkey, 17 p.
2011-9	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	A systemic perspective on multi-stakeholder sustainable development strategies, 26 p.
2011-10	Tibert Verhagen Jaap van Nes Frans Feldberg Willemijn van Dolen	Virtual customer service agents: Using social presence and personalization to shape online service encounters, 48 p.
2011-11	Henk J. Scholten Maarten van der Vlist	De inrichting van crisisbeheersing, de relatie tussen besluitvorming en informatievoorziening. Casus: Warroom project Netcentrisch werken bij Rijkswaterstaat, 23 p.
2011-12	Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	A socio-economic impact analysis of cultural diversity, 22 p.
2011-13	Aliye Ahu Akgün Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	Repositioning rural areas as promising future hot spots, 22 p.
2011-14	Selmar Meents Tibert Verhagen Paul Vlaar	How sellers can stimulate purchasing in electronic marketplaces: Using information as a risk reduction signal, 29 p.

2011-15	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Measuring regional creative capacity: A literature review for rural-specific approaches, 22 p.
2011-16	Frank Bruinsma Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Tourism, culture and e-services: Evaluation of e-services packages, 30 p.
2011-17	Peter Nijkamp Frank Bruinsma Karima Kourtit Eveline van Leeuwen	Supply of and demand for e-services in the cultural sector: Combining top-down and bottom-up perspectives, 16 p.
2011-18	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Climate change: From global concern to regional challenge, 17 p.
2011-19	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Operational advances in tourism research, 25 p.
2011-20	Aliye Ahu Akgün Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	Creative capacity for sustainable development: A comparative analysis of European and Turkish rural regions, 18 p.
2011-21	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Business dynamics as the source of counterurbanisation: An empirical analysis of Turkey, 18 p.
2011-22	Jessie Bakens Peter Nijkamp	Lessons from migration impact analysis, 19 p.
2011-23	Peter Nijkamp Galit Cohen-blankshtain	Opportunities and pitfalls of local e-democracy, 17 p.
2011-24	Maura Soekijad Irene Skovgaard Smith	The 'lean people' in hospital change: Identity work as social differentiation, 30 p.
2011-25	Evgenia Motchenkova Olgerd Rus	Research joint ventures and price collusion: Joint analysis of the impact of R&D subsidies and antitrust fines, 30 p.
2011-26	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Strategic choice analysis by expert panels for migration impact assessment, 41 p.
2011-27	Farook Lazrak Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld Jan Rouwendal	The market value of listed heritage: An urban economic application of spatial hedonic pricing, 24 p.
2011-28	Peter Nijkamp	Socio-economic impacts of heterogeneity among foreign migrants: Research and policy challenges, 17 p.
2011-29	Masood Gheasi Peter Nijkamp	Migration, tourism and international trade: Evidence from the UK, 8 p.
2011-30	Karima Kourtit	Evaluation of cyber-tools in cultural tourism, 24 p.

	Peter Nijkamp Eveline van Leeuwen Frank Bruinsma	
2011-31	Cathy Macharis Peter Nijkamp	Possible bias in multi-actor multi-criteria transportation evaluation: Issues and solutions, 16 p.
2011-32	John Steenbruggen Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Peter Nijkamp Henk Scholten	The use of GSM data for transport safety management: An exploratory review, 29 p.
2011-33	John Steenbruggen Peter Nijkamp Jan M. Smits Michel Grothe	Traffic incident management: A common operational picture to support situational awareness of sustainable mobility, 36 p.
2011-34	Tüzün Baycan Peter Nijkamp	Students' interest in an entrepreneurial career in a multicultural society, 25 p.
2011-35	Adele Finco Deborah Bentivoglio Peter Nijkamp	Integrated evaluation of biofuel production options in agriculture: An exploration of sustainable policy scenarios, 16 p.
2011-36	Eric de Noronha Vaz Pedro Cabral Mário Caetano Peter Nijkamp Marco Painho	Urban heritage endangerment at the interface of future cities and past heritage: A spatial vulnerability assessment, 25 p.
2011-37	Maria Giaoutzi Anastasia Stratigea Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Scenario analysis in foresight: AG2020, 23 p.
2011-38	Peter Nijkamp Patricia van Hemert	Knowledge infrastructure and regional growth, 12 p.
2011-39	Patricia van Hemert Enno Masurel Peter Nijkamp	The role of knowledge sources of SME's for innovation perception and regional innovation policy, 27 p.
2011-40	Eric de Noronha Vaz Marco Painho Peter Nijkamp	Impacts of environmental law and regulations on agricultural land-use change and urban pressure: The Algarve case, 18 p.
2011-41	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp Steeff Lowik Frans van Vught Paul Vulto	From islands of innovation to creative hotspots, 26 p.
2011-42	Alina Todiras Peter Nijkamp Saidas Rafijevas	Innovative marketing strategies for national industrial flagships: Brand repositioning for accessing upscale markets, 27 p.

2011-43	Eric de Noronha Vaz Mário Caetano Peter Nijkamp	A multi-level spatial urban pressure analysis of the Giza Pyramid Plateau in Egypt, 18 p.
2011-44	Andrea Caragliu Chiara Del Bo Peter Nijkamp	A map of human capital in European cities, 36 p.
2011-45	Patrizia Lombardi Silvia Giordano Andrea Caragliu Chiara Del Bo Mark Deakin Peter Nijkamp Karima Kourtiti	An advanced triple-helix network model for smart cities performance, 22 p.
2011-46	Jessie Bakens Peter Nijkamp	Migrant heterogeneity and urban development: A conceptual analysis, 17 p.
2011-47	Irene Casas Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Biagio Ciuffo Peter Nijkamp	Short and long term effects of sustainable mobility policy: An exploratory case study, 20 p.
2011-48	Christian Bogmans	Can globalization outweigh free-riding? 27 p.
2011-49	Karim Abbas Bernd Heidergott Djamil Aïssani	A Taylor series expansion approach to the functional approximation of finite queues, 26 p.
2011-50	Eric Koomen	Indicators of rural vitality. A GIS-based analysis of socio-economic development of the rural Netherlands, 17 p.

2012-1	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan Levent Peter Nijkamp Jacques Poot	The role of local and newcomer entrepreneurs in rural development: A comparative meta-analytic study, 39 p.
2012-2	Joao Romao Bart Neuts Peter Nijkamp Eveline van Leeuwen	Urban tourist complexes as Multi-product companies: Market segmentation and product differentiation in Amsterdam, 18 p.
2012-3	Vincent A.C. van den Berg	Step tolling with price sensitive demand: Why more steps in the toll makes the consumer better off, 20 p.
2012-4	Vasco Diogo Eric Koomen Floor van der Hilst	Second generation biofuel production in the Netherlands. A spatially-explicit exploration of the economic viability of a perennial biofuel crop, 12 p.
2012-5	Thijs Dekker Paul Koster Roy Brouwer	Changing with the tide: Semi-parametric estimation of preference dynamics, 50 p.
2012-6	Daniel Arribas Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Benchmarking of world cities through self-organizing maps, 22 p.
2012-7	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp Frans van Vught Paul Vulto	Supernova stars in knowledge-based regions, 24 p.
2012-8	Mediha Sahin Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	The economic importance of migrant entrepreneurship: An application of data envelopment analysis in the Netherlands, 16 p.
2012-9	Peter Nijkamp Jacques Poot	Migration impact assessment: A state of the art, 48 p.
2012-10	Tibert Verhagen Anniek Nauta Frans Feldberg	Negative online word-of-mouth: Behavioral indicator or emotional release? 29 p.

2013-1	Tüzün Baycan Peter Nijkamp	The migration development nexus: New perspectives and challenges, 22 p.
2013-2	Haralambie Leahu	European Options Sensitivities via Monte Carlo Techniques, 28 p.
2013-3	Tibert Verhagen Charlotte Vonkeman Frans Feldberg Plon Verhagen	Making online products more tangible and likeable: The role of local presence as product presentation mechanism, 44 p.
2013-4	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	A Multi-actor multi-criteria scenario analysis of regional sustainable resource policy, 24 p.
2013-5	John Steenbruggen Peter Nijkamp Maarten van der Vlist	Urban traffic incident management in a digital society. An actor-network approach in information technology use in urban Europe, 25 p.
2013-6	Jorge Ridderstaat Robertico Croes Peter Nijkamp	The force field of tourism, 19 p.
2013-7	Masood Gheasi Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Unknown diversity: A study on undocumented migrant workers in the Dutch household sector, 17 p.
2013-8	Mediha Sahin Peter Nijkamp Soushi Suzuki	Survival of the fittest among migrant entrepreneurs. A study on differences in the efficiency performance of migrant entrepreneurs in Amsterdam by means of data envelopment analysis, 25 p.
2013-9	Kostas Bithas Peter Nijkamp	Biological integrity as a prerequisite for sustainable development: A bioeconomic perspective, 24 p.
2013-10	Madalina-Stefania Dirzu Peter Nijkamp	The dynamics of agglomeration processes and their contribution to regional development across the EU, 19 p.
2013-11	Eric de Noronha Vaz Agnieszka Walczynska Peter Nijkamp	Regional challenges in tourist wetland systems: An integrated approach to the Ria Formosa area, 17 p.
2013-12	João Romão Eveline van Leeuwen Bart Neuts Peter Nijkamp	Tourist loyalty and urban e-services: A comparison of behavioural impacts in Leipzig and Amsterdam, 19 p.
2013-13	Jorge Ridderstaat Marck Oduber Robertico Croes Peter Nijkamp Pim Martens	Impacts of seasonal patterns of climate on recurrent fluctuations in tourism demand. Evidence from Aruba, 34 p.
2013-14	Emmanouil Tranos Peter Nijkamp	Urban and regional analysis and the digital revolution: Challenges and opportunities, 16 p.
2013-15	Masood Gheasi	International financial transfer by foreign labour: An analysis of remittances

	Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	from informal migrants, 11 p.
2013-16	Serenella Sala Biagio Ciuffo Peter Nijkamp	A meta-framework for sustainability assessment, 24 p.
2013-17	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp Aliye Ahu Akgün Masood Gheasi	Foresights, scenarios and sustainable development – a pluriformity perspective, 19 p.
2013-18	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Analytical support tools for sustainable futures, 19 p.